REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the allowance of claims 6-13 over the prior art. Every effort is being made to place the application in early condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended the specification and claims to more particularly define the invention taking into consideration the outstanding Official Action. The specification has been amended to correct "recession(s)" to "recess(es)" in paragraphs [0011], [0023], [0025] through [0027] as required by the Examiner in the Official Action. Accordingly, the objection to the specification is believed to be obviated by these amendments and it is therefore most respectfully requested that these objections be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended as required by the Examiner to correct "recession(s)" to "recess(es)". It is most respectfully requested that these objections be withdrawn in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 14. In addition, the limitation from allowable claim 15 has been added to claim 14 making this claim allowable. Claims 15-18 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants most respectfully submit that all the claims now present in the application are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 and are clearly patentable over the references of record.

The rejection of claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Larson et al. has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendment to claim 14 and the cancellation of claim 16 and the following comments.

Applicant wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2131 which states that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is

> contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed.Cir. 1990).

Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The objection to claim 15 has been obviated by the cancellation of this claim. It is therefore most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the specification and claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By: Richard E. Fichter
Richard E. Fichter
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, 4th Fl.
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

REF:kdd
A01.wpd

June 8, 2005